

The remark is worthy of notice only in this way: Nurses are too busy to have social aspirations, but it is this spirit carried into the ward that has lost to the Army Nurse Corps some of the finest nurses it has numbered among its members—women who have held on, hoping against hope that Congress would make some distinction other than the amount of pay received between the women who have given years of hard study in preparation for their lifework and the men who have had no training.

During the last year three hundred and twelve graduated nurses applied for admission to the corps; and these, in addition to those already on the reserve list, would make a very fair showing as an "eligible list."

But do not question our patriotism. Should occasion arise, the supply would far exceed the demand, but at the present time loyalty to those already giving their work to their country is more important.

"A true American nurse,"

SARAH R. SMITH,
Wilksburg, Pa.

[We think this writer has failed to grasp the true meaning of patriotism, which, as we understand it, is the highest sentiment of which a human being is capable. Love of country is something entirely above and beyond selfish or mercenary ends.

Our comment had nothing to do with the present conditions in the army, a discussion of which we reserve until a later issue. The plan for an eligible volunteer list to serve the country in time of national calamity or war has for its motive simply the enrollment of a list of carefully investigated nurses, that when the need comes selection may be made that will prevent the wild confusion of the Spanish War experience, when too many nurses accepted under the stress of war conditions *did not reflect credit* upon the morals, manners, dignity, or womanliness of the nursing profession. That a nurse's name is on that list does not compel her to serve if for any reason circumstances are such that she cannot do so when a call comes.

Among men we have the State militia, where the members stand ready to serve their State or country at any hour. The eligible volunteer list of nurses should mean practically a national militia of nurses, but if we are to judge by this writer the spirit seems to be lacking.—ED.]

DEAR EDITOR: When the registration act was first suggested and eventually framed in New York I believe the intention was to allow all graduate nurses in good standing who could give evidence of a two-years' training to register without examination, the merely experienced nurses to be registered if they could demonstrate their right to recognition by passing an examination, the time limit being three years. So far so good.

What has happened? Amendments were introduced and carried with the result that the bill as it was passed differed in many respects

from the one originally drafted by the Legislative Committee, with the result that a large body of nurses are being refused registration on the plea that their schools are not now up to the standard. This is resulting in arraying hundreds of nurses against the whole movement.

Nurses whose schools are not up to the standard, or that for any reason have not been registered with the Regents, are advised that they may be recognized by passing an examination. This idea is extremely unpopular, as it classes graduates with the experienced nurses. Many would rather not be registered than obtain their R.N. in this way.

Now, does it seem quite fair to make nurses who graduated years ago responsible for the standard of their schools? There was not then the same choice of schools that there is now. Women went in good faith and took what was available at the time.

Many schools will not be ready to register for years, perhaps. Would it not be fairer to allow those nurses who are in good standing to register and have them with us in the movement, rather than against us or in a state of inertia?

With only nine hundred applications for State registration in a year and a half, it seems to me that the ultimate object of registration would be obtained more quickly with the active coöperation of the larger body, while nothing is to be gained by keeping them out. I would like to ask for the opinion of other nurses on this subject through the pages of the JOURNAL.

M. A. M.,
New York City.

DEAR EDITOR: May I take exception to some points in Miss Saffair's letter to the Editor in the October number of the JOURNAL? I am sorry that it should be read by so many nurses who share her dissatisfied feelings and think it "a good thought well expressed."

It is my opinion that nurses who, in discussing the subject of bringing our profession to a higher standard or how higher education will affect the nurse in private practice, first ask the questions: What does the future offer us more than the past? Will it make our lives easier? Will the future nurse not have to work so hard while in training and after? can never prove beneficial to the profession or public.

Would not the sincere desire to raise our standard induce us to ask: How much more and better care shall we be able to give in the future than in the past? Will it make our lives more valuable and serviceable? And how can we help admiring and respecting the future nurse for her more thorough training through harder work and more studies?

Certainly more pay and less work are not what a nurse in private